

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7

8 THOMAS ATHONY DIBARTOLO,
9

10 Petitioner,

11 v.
12 STATE OF WASHINGTON,
13

14 Respondent.

15 NO: 2:15-CV-291-RMP
16

17 ORDER DISMISSING PETITION
18

19 BEFORE THE COURT is Petitioner's single page document titled, "Notice
20 of Appeal Request for Extention of Time to File," which was liberally construed as
1 a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus by a Person in State Custody pursuant to 28
2 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner, a Washington State prisoner incarcerated at the Rhode
3 Island Department of Corrections, Maximum Security, is proceeding *pro se* and
4 has paid the \$5.00 filing fee to commence this action.

5 It is unclear what Petitioner is trying to accomplish with this most recent
6 submission. Earlier this year, Mr. DiBartolo filed a habeas petition which was
7 transferred to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals as second or successive. *See*

1 2:15-cv-00051-SMJ, *DiBartolo v. State of Washington et al.*. On June 25, 2015,
2 the Ninth Circuit denied Petitioner's application for authorization to file a second
3 or successive 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas corpus petition in the district court.

4 Petitioner now appears to be attempting to appeal Washington state court
5 decisions to this Court. This Court, however, is precluded from exercising
6 appellate jurisdiction over the decisions of the Washington state courts. *See*
7 *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462 (1983)(holding
8 that federal district courts may not exercise appellate jurisdiction over state court
9 decisions); *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413 (1923). This rule applies
10 even when the challenge to the state court's action involves federal constitutional
11 issues. *See Feldman*, 460 U.S. at 484-86; *Worldwide Church of God v. McNair*,
12 805 F.2d 888, 892-93 (9th Cir. 1986). Therefore, pursuant to the *Rooker-Feldman*
13 doctrine, this Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction over Petitioner's claims.

14 Rather, the proper method by which a person may challenge his state court
15 conviction is a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.
16 *See Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 487-90 (1973)(if a state prisoner
17 challenges the fact or duration of his confinement, or seeks a determination that he
18 is entitled to release or a shortening of his period of confinement, his only federal
19 remedy is a writ of habeas corpus, with its requirement of exhaustion of state
20 remedies). Based on Petitioner's prior habeas petitions, it would appear that this

1 avenue is foreclosed to Petitioner unless he can meet the requirements of 28 U.S.C.
2 § 2244(b)(2).

3 **IT IS ORDERED** that this action is **DISMISSED** for lack of subject matter
4 jurisdiction.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The Clerk of Court is directed to enter this Order,
6 enter judgment, forward copies to Petitioner and close the file. The Court further
7 certifies that there is no basis upon which to issue a certificate of appealability. 28
8 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Fed. R.App. P. 22(b).

9 **DATED** this 4th day of December 2015.

10
11 _____
12 *s/ Rosanna Malouf Peterson*
ROSANNA MALOUF PETERSON
13 Chief United States District Court Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20